

# REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-17 and 20 remain in this application. Claims 1, 16 and 20 have been amended and claims 15, 19 have been canceled, without prejudice to refiling. No new matter is added.

The applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his careful reading of the application. Claims 16 and 20 have been amended to correct informalities and to recited that the memory is required to have instructions.

The Office Action states that the present application has only been accorded the filing date of the instant application, which is March 5, 2002. All the presently pending claims recite retrieval and extraction of pathway information from databases. Applicants acknowledge the priority date, and have therefore provided the Examiner with a substitute ADS in which the previously cited priority claims are deleted. The priority information is also deleted from the specification.

Paragraph [66] has been amended to remove the hyperlinks. All subject matter provided in hyperlinks was non-essential, illustrating the state of the art. No new matter is added by the deletion.

Claims 16-20 were objected to for informalities, which informalities have been corrected. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Office Action states that the claims lack a correlation between the groups of sequences and the information extraction algorithm. Independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this correlation. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Koza et al. The Office Action states that the rejection is predicated in the broadest reasonable interpretation given to the phrase, "memory configured to store instructions for execution". Independent Claims 16 and 20 have been amended to recite that the memory has the instructions. In view of the amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 14, 16-18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Eisen *et al.* in view of Andrade *et al.* and Cocks *et al.* Claims 1, 4, 11-13, 16-18 and 20 have

been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Eisen *et al.* in view of Ng *et al.* and Cocks *et al.*

Independent claims 1, 16 and 20 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 15; the use of scores of publication ranking to rank pathway information, which was stated in the Office Action to be free of the prior art.


In view of the above amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a Telephone Conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any other fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required by this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0815, order number AGYT-011CIP2

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 26, 2004

By:   
Pamela J. Sherwood, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 36,677

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP  
200 Middlefield Road, Suite 200  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Telephone: (650) 327-3400  
Facsimile: (650) 327-3231